UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,043	10/30/2001	Joubert Berger	10013500-1	7770

7590   10/19/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/013,043	BERGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kuo-Liang J Tang	2122

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 October 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/3/03</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 10/30/2001.

The priority date for this application is 10/30/2001.

Claims 1-25 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2.   Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-19 and 21-24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Franco et al., US Patent No. 6,687,745 (hereinafter Franco).

As Per Claim 1, Franco teaches that presenting the application and the second

information based upon the presentational information, and storing on the client computer

an interactive link for selectively re-establishing the second communication connection to

the application server for retrieving the first information and presenting the application

and the second information on an as-needed basis. (E.g. see Abstract and associated text).

In that Franco discloses the method that covering the steps of a method for installing an

application in a operating system, comprising:

"enabling selection of an application from one or more applications (e.g. see col.

4:18-24, which states "... selectively retrieving and presenting remotely stored

applications ... ")";

"enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said selected application towards a graphical representation of a compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, dragged and dropped) of said trusted operating system (e.g. see col. 20: 1-4, which states "... the attachment appears as a known file type ...", the examiner inteprets that the client 25 is a secured operating system because the attachment is a known file type to the client; also see col. 17:65 to col. 18:7);

"enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said application on said graphical representation of said compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet–enabled)"; and

"automatically installing said selected application in said selected compartment in response to said dropping of said graphical representation of said selected application (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, which states "... attachment is copied onto ...")".

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco teaches:

"automatically determining one or more supporting resources (e.g. see col. 20:9-14, droplet-enabled survey application and/or information) associated with said selected application";

"automatically retrieving said supporting resources (e.g. see col. 20:14, retrieved)"; and

"automatically installing said supporting resources within said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14)".

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco

teaches:

"automatically determining access controls for one or more files associated with

said selected application (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states "The file generated during

the downloading operation is accessed to support the representation operation ...")"; and

"automatically setting said determined access controls for said one or more files

(e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states "...the details/content of the file are determined by

the parameters that embedded the downloadable item (link) into the informational content

36 delivered to the client computer 20 ...")".

As Per claim 6, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"automatically selecting one or more library files (e.g. see col. 18:23-28)".

As Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"automatically selecting one or more configuration files (e.g. see FIG. 1, file 74

and associated text, and col. 4:46-47, network configured computer processing system)".

As Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"automatically determining access controls for at least one of said files based at

least in part on the type of the file (e.g. see col. 20:3)".

As Per claim 10, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco

teaches

"automatically determining access controls for at least one of said files based at least in part on the location of the file (e.g. see FIG. 1, link 72 and associated text)".

As Per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said application in close proximity to said graphical representation of said compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14)".

As Per claim 12, Franco teaches a method for installing an application in a compartment-based trusted operating system, comprising:

"displaying a graphical representation of a plurality of compartments of said trusted operating system (e.g. see FIG. 2 and associated text and see col. 20: 1-4, which states "... the attachment appears as a known file type ...", the examiner inteprets that the client 25 is a secured operating system because the attachment is a known file type to the client; also see col. 17:65 to col. 18:7))";

"enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said application towards a graphical representation of a compartment of said plurality of compartments (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, dragged and dropped)";

"enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said application on said graphical representation of said compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet–enabled)"; and

"automatically installing said application in said selected compartment in response to said dropping of said graphical representation of said compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, which states "... attachment is copied onto ...")".

As per Claims 13-14, the rejection of claim 12 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2-3 respectfully.

As Per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"assigning a compartment label unique to said compartment to each of said supporting resources (e.g. see col. 5:20-29)".

As per Claim 16, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 11.

As Per claim 17, Franco teaches a graphical software installation tool for installing an application in a trusted operating system, comprising:

"a graphical user interface (e.g. see FIG. 2, text box 112 and associated text)", comprising:

"a display portion displaying at least one compartment of said trusted operating system (e.g. see FIG. 2, web page 100 and associated text)"; and

"an application portion comprising a graphical representation of at least one application, said graphical representation of said at least one application

operable to be dragged from said application portion to said display portion,

wherein dropping of said graphical representation of said at least one application

on a graphical representation of said at least one compartment causes automatic

installation of said application in said compartment (e.g. see FIG. 2 and associated

text, i.e. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14)".

As per Claims 18-19, the rejection of claim 17 are incorporated and are rejected

under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 11 and 3

respectfully.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected under

the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 9-10.

As Per claim 22, Franco teaches a method for installing an application in a trusted

operating system, comprising:

"enabling selection of an application from one or more applications (e.g. see col.

4:18-24, which states "... selectively retrieving and presenting remotely stored

applications ... ")";

"enabling association of said selected application (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col.

20:14) with a compartment of the trusted operating system (e.g. see col. 20: 1-4, which

states "... the attachment appears as a known file type ...", the examiner inteprets that the

client 25 is a secured operating system because the attachment is a known file type to the

client; also see col. 17:65 to col. 18:7)"; and

"automatically installing said selected application in said selected compartment in response to said association of said selected application with said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, which states "… attachment is copied onto …")".

As Per claim 23, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said selected application towards a graphical representation of said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, dragged and dropped)"; and

"enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said selected application on said graphical representation of said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet–enabled)".

As Per claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said selected application in close proximity to said graphical representation of said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet–enabled)".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 4-5, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Franco in view of Bearden et al. US Patent No. 6,550,061 (hereinafter Bearden).

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco does

not explicitly disclose displaying file access control. However, Bearden in an analogous

art teaches in a manner such as "displaying said access controls along with the files with

which said access controls are associated". (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e.

see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of

Bearden into the teaching of Franco to display file access control. The modification

would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators

privileges.

As Per claim 5, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco does

not explicitly disclose modifying access controls in response to a user input. However,

Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as "modifying said access controls

in response to a user input". (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-

42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into

the teaching of Franco to modify access controls in response to a user input. The

modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with

administrators privileges.

As per Claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 4.

As Per claim 25, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Franco teaches

"automatically determining access controls for one or more files associated with said selected application (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states "The file generated during the downloading operation is accessed to support the representation operation ...")"; and

"automatically setting said determined access controls for said one or more files (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states "...the details/content of the file are determined by the parameters that embedded the downloadable item (link) into the informational content 36 delivered to the client computer 20 ...")".

Franco does not explicitly disclose displaying file access control. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as "displaying said access controls along with the files with which said access controls are associated". (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into the teaching of Franco to display file access control. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators privileges.

Franco does not explicitly disclose modifying access controls in response to a user input. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as "modifying

said access controls in response to a user input". (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text,

i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching

of Bearden into the teaching of Franco to modify access controls in response to a user

input. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with

administrators privileges.

4.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco in

view of Andersen et al. US Patent No. 6,795,963 (hereinafter Andersen).

As Per claim 8, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Franco does

not explicitly disclose querying an executable file. However, Andersen in an analogous

art teaches in a manner such as "querying an executable file (E.g. see col. 11:21-25)".

Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Andersen into the

teaching of Franco to query an executable file. The modification would have been

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a

debugger to enhance analysis of core files in an interactive debugging environment.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

After October 25, 2004, examiner can be reached at new telephone number (571) 272-3705, and the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER